

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

*Kearney*

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed idea of using cationic starch in claims as reactive material and unexpected benefits from doing so. Also discussed Asano materials and possible use of other specific reactive materials. The examiner noted that this would raise new issues after final.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yokota, Asano

Claim(s) discussed: 1+

Agreement ☐ was reached ☒ was not reached

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description:

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televised Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Date of interview: 10/11/07

(1) R. Bareford  
(2) J. Hayhurst  
(3) J. Roper  
(4) M. Devon

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

DATE MAILED: 1792

ART UNIT	Bareford
PAPER NUMBER	
EXAMINER	

APPLICATION NUMBER	10/691,890
FILING DATE	10/16/03
FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	Urscheler
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	

